



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,214	11/18/2003	Valerie Kucharewski	06975-444001	2244
26171	7590	10/09/2007		
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER BHATIA, AJAY M	
			ART UNIT 2145	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,214

Applicant(s)

KUCHAREWSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Ajay M. Bhatia

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/2/07

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 15-16, 21-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US006247043) in view of Skarbo et al. (US Patent 5,835,089).

For claim 1, Bates teaches, a method for enabling management of contacts, the method comprising:

maintaining a collection of contacts in a central repository; (Bates, Col. 7 lines 15-40, master database)

enabling a member to define a group of contracts from among the collection of contacts; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

in response to the member defining a group of contacts, creating the group of contacts defined by the member; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

Art Unit: 2145

representing the group of contacts with a unique specific identifier; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, name)

and enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of the applications by using the specific identifier by which the group is represented to address communications that are to be sent to the group of contacts. (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, name)

Bates fails to clearly disclose, multiple different applications

Skarbo teaches, multiple different applications (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference)

Bates and Skarbo are both in the field of electronic contact information storage

Bates and Skarbo are compatible because they both are based on a centralize storage of contact information

It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bates system of auto group with Skarbo system of making it available to multiple application it simplifies the maintenance of the address information of applications (Skarbo, Col. 2 lines 46-47)

Art Unit: 2145

For claim 2, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 1 further comprising enabling the member to send a copy of the group of contacts to a recipient. (Bates, Col. 8 lines 50-67, copies)

For claim 3, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 2 further comprising:

receiving a request from the member or the recipient to modify the group; (Bates, Col. 9 lines 5-30, group members)

and updating copies of the group held by the member and the recipient to reflect the requested change. (Bates, Col. 9 lines 5-30, updates)

For claim 4, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 3 further comprising notifying the member and the recipient of the requested change to the group. (Bates, Col. 9 lines 5-30, shared)

For claim 5, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein the multiple different applications include multiple different communications applications. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 5.

For claim 6, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 5 wherein the multiple different communications applications include an e-mail application and at least one application other

Art Unit: 2145

than an e-mail application. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 6.

For claim 7, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 5 wherein the multiple different communications applications include an instant messaging application and at least one application other than an instant messaging application. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 7.

For claim 8, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 5 wherein the multiple different communications applications include a digital image sharing application and at least one application other than a digital image sharing application. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 8.

For claim 9, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 5 wherein the multiple different communications applications include an alerting application that sends alerts and reminders to users and at least one application other than an alerting application that sends alerts and reminders to users. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 9.

Art Unit: 2145

For claim 10, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 5 wherein the multiple different communications applications include an application for sharing and exchanging contact information and at least one application other than an application for sharing and exchanging contact information. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 10.

For claim 11, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein the multiple different applications include other sharing applications. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20; fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 11.

For claim 12, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 11 wherein the other sharing applications include an electronic journal application and at least one application other than an electronic journal application. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 12.

For claim 15, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein each of the contacts is listed in the collection of contacts and in the group of contacts by a single identifier. (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, name)

For claim 16, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 15 wherein the single identifier is an e-mail address. (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, name)

Art Unit: 2145

For claim 21, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein enabling a member to define a group of contacts from among the collection of contacts comprises:

enabling the member to use a graphical user interface to specify contacts from the collection of contacts to be included in the group of contacts; (Bates, Col. 12 lines 40-56, figure8, display)

and enabling the member to name the group of contacts. (Bates, Col. 9 lines 5-30, group)

For claim 22, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein enabling a member to define a group contacts from among the collection of contacts comprises:

recognizing a set of contacts from the collection of contacts as repeated recipients of communications sent by a member; (Bates, Col. 3 lines 55-67, threshold)

and enabling the member to define a group containing the set of contacts without actively specifying the set of contacts. (Bates, Col. 3 lines 55-67, threshold)

For claim 23, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 22 wherein recognizing a set of contacts from the collection as repeated recipients of communications sent by a member comprises:

storing communications sent by the member during a period of time; (Bates, Col. 3 lines 55-67, threshold)

Art Unit: 2145

examining the communications sent by the member during the period of time; (Bates, Col. 3 lines 55-67, threshold)

and identifying a set of contacts that was sent at least a minimum number of communications by the member during the period of time. (Bates, Col. 3 lines 55-67, threshold)

For claim 24, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 23 wherein storing and examining communications sent by the member during a period of time comprises storing and examining communications sent by the member using multiple different applications. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 24.

For claim 25, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 22 wherein recognizing a set of contacts from the collection as repeated recipients of communications sent by a member comprises:

storing a predetermined number of communications sent by the member; (Bates, Col. 3 lines 55-67, threshold)

examining the predetermined number of communications sent by the member; (Bates, Col. 3 lines 55-67, threshold)

and identifying a set of contacts that was sent at least a minimum number of communications out of the predetermined number of communications by the member. (Bates, Col. 3 lines 55-67, threshold)

Art Unit: 2145

For claim 26, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 25 wherein storing and examining the predetermined number of communications sent by the member comprises storing and examining communications sent by the user using multiple different applications. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 24.

For claim 27, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 22 wherein enabling the member to define a group containing the set of contacts comprises enabling the member to name the recognized set of contacts. (Bates, Col. 9 lines 5-30, groups)

For claim 28, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein permissions and preferences of all contacts in the group are the same. (Bates, Col. 9 lines 5-30, groups)

For claim 29, Bates-Skarbo teaches, an apparatus comprising a tangible computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon that when executed by a machine result in at least the following:

maintaining a collection of contacts in a central repository; (Bates, Col. 7 lines 15-40, master database)

enabling a member to define a group of contacts from among the collection of contacts; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

in response to the member defining a group of contacts, creating the group of contacts defined by the member; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

Art Unit: 2145

representing the group of contacts with a specific identifier; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

and enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of multiple different applications by using the specific identifier by which the group is represented to address communications that are to be sent to the group of contacts. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 29.

For claim 30, Bates-Skarbo teaches, a system for enabling management of contacts comprising:

means for maintaining a collection of contacts in a central repository; (Bates, Col. 7 lines 15-40, master database)

means for enabling a member to define a group of contacts from among the collection of contacts; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

means for creating a group of contacts defined by the member in response to defining the group of contacts; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

means for representing the group of contacts with a specific identifier; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

and means for enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of multiple different applications by using the specific identifier by which the group is represented to address communications that are to be sent to the group of contacts. (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 30.

For claim 31, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein:

representing the group of contacts with a specific identifier comprises representing the group of contacts with a unique identifier; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, name)

and enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of multiple different applications by using the specific identifier by which the group is represented to address communications that are to be sent to the group of contacts comprises enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of multiple different applications by using the unique identifier by which the group is represented. (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, name) and (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 31.

For claim 32, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein maintaining a collection of contacts in a central repository, comprises creating a collection of contacts to be stored in the central repository. (Bates, Col. 7 lines 15-40, master database)

For claim 33, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 1 further comprising:

enabling another member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of the multiple different applications by using the specific identifier by which the group is represented to address communications that are to be sent to the group of contacts; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

Art Unit: 2145

receiving, from the member, a first communication sent using a first application and addressed to the specific identifier by which the group is represented; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

in response to receiving the first communication sent using the first application and addressed to the specific identifier by which the group is represented, delivering the first communication to the group of contacts using the first application; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

receiving, from the other member, a second communication sent using a second application and addressed to the specific identifier by which the group is represented; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

and in response to receiving the second communication sent using the second application and addressed to the specific identifier by which the group is represented, delivering the second communication to the group of contacts using the second application. (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group) and (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 33.

For claim 34, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 33 wherein the first application and the second application are different types of communication applications such that:

receiving, from the member, a first communication sent using a first application and addressed to the specific identifier by which the group is represented comprises receiving a first communication sent using a first communication application; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

delivering the first communication to the group of contacts using the first application comprising delivering the first communication to the group of contacts using the first communication application; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

receiving, from the other member, a second communication sent using a second application and addressed to the specific identifier by which the group is represented comprises receiving a second communication sent using a second communication application that is a different type of communication application than the first communication application; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

and delivering the second communication to the group of contacts using the second application comprises delivering the second communication to the group of contacts using the second communication application that is of a different type than the first communication application. (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group) and (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 34.

For claim 35, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the method of claim 34 wherein the first communication application comprises an e-mail application and the second communication application comprises an instant messaging application such that:

receiving a first communication sent using a first communication application comprises receiving a first communication sent using the e-mail application; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

Art Unit: 2145

delivering the first communication to the group of contacts using the first communication application comprises delivering the first communication to the group of contacts using the e-mail application; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

receiving a second communication sent using a second communication application that is a different type of communication application than the first communication application comprises receiving a second communication sent using an instant messaging application; . (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group) and (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference)

and delivering the second communication to the group of contacts using the second communication application that is of a different type than the first communication application comprises delivering the second communication to the group of contacts using the instant messaging application. . (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group) and (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 35.

For claim 36, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the apparatus of claim 29 wherein:

the instructions that when executed by a machine result in representing the group of contacts with a specific identifier comprise instructions that when executed by a machine result in representing the group of contacts with a unique identifier; . (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group)

and the instructions that when executed by a machine result in enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of multiple different applications by using the specific identifier by which the group is represented to address communications that are to be sent to the group of contacts comprise instructions that when executed by a machine

Art Unit: 2145

result in enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of multiple different applications by using the unique identifier by which the group is represented. .

(Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group) and (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 36.

For claim 37, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the apparatus of claim 29 wherein the instructions that when executed by a machine result in maintaining a collection of contacts in a central repository comprise instructions that when executed by a machine result in creating a collection of contacts to be stored in the central repository. (Bates, Col. 7 lines 15-40, master database)

For claim 38, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the system of claim 30 wherein:

the means for representing the group of contacts with a specific identifier comprises means for representing the group of contacts with a unique identifier; (Bates, Col. 7 lines 15-40, master database)

and the means for enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of multiple different applications by using the specific identifier by which the group is represented to address communications that are to be sent to the group of contacts comprises means for enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of multiple different applications by using the unique identifier by which the group is represented. (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group) and (Skarbo, Col. 4 lines 11-20, fax, email, video conference)

For claim 39, Bates-Skarbo teaches, the system of claim 30 wherein the means for maintaining a collection of contacts in a central repository comprises means for creating a collection of contacts to be stored in the central repository. (Bates, Col. 7 lines 15-40, master database)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates-Skarbo in view of Mathew (US Patent Publication 2004/0003071).

For claim 13, Bates-Skarbo fails to clearly disclose, the method of claim 11 wherein the other sharing applications include an e-mail filtering application and at least one application other than an e-mail filtering application.

Mathew teaches, the method of claim 11 wherein the other sharing applications include an e-mail filtering application and at least one application other than an e-mail filtering application. (Mathew, paragraph 44)

Bates and Mathew are both in the field of email communication

Bates and Mathew are compatible because Mathew is a modification of receiving and sending

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add the feature of Parental Control provided by Mathew to that of Bates because it would allow for the parents to have customizable control. (Mathew, paragraph 5)

For claim 14, Bates-Skarbo-Mathew teaches, the method of claim 11 wherein the other sharing applications include an application that enables the specification of parental controls over a child account and at least one application other than an application that enables the specification of parental controls over a child account. (Mathew, paragraph 44)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates-Skarbo in view of Stimmel (US Patent 6678719).

For claim 17, Bates-Skarbo fails to clearly disclose, the method of claim 15 wherein the single identifier is a screen name.

Stimmel teaches, the method of claim 15 wherein the single identifier is a screen name.
(Stimmel, Col. 3 line 55 to Col. 4 line 2, user)

Bates and Stimmel are in the filed of contact information

Bates and Stimmel are compatible because Stimmel adds more interface for additional programs

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add the features of Stimmel to Bates because Stimmel allows for improved communication by providing status information. (Stimmel, Col. 1 lines 52-67)

For claim 18, Bates-Skarbo-Stimmel teaches, the method of claim 15 wherein the single identifier is a cellular phone number. (Stimmel, Col. 3 line 55 to Col. 4 line 2, user) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 17, applies equally as well to claim 18.

For claim 19, Bates-Skarbo-Stimmel teaches, the method of claim 15 wherein enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of multiple different applications by using the specific identifier by which the group is represented to address communications that are to be sent to the group of contacts comprises:

receiving an indication of a selected application to use to send a communication to the group of contacts; (Skarbo, Col. 9 lines 20-50, app)

Art Unit: 2145

recognizing that a contact within the group of contacts is identified by a single identifier that is inoperable for addressing a message to be sent; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group) using the selected application; (Skarbo, Col. 9 lines 20-50, app) prompting the member for a different single identifier for the contact that may be used to address the message to be sent using the selected application; (Bates, Col. 8 lines 15-50, group) and replacing the single identifier with the different single identifier in the group of contacts. . (Skarbo, Col. 9 lines 20-50, entry)

For claim 20, Bates-Skarbo-Stimmel teaches, the method of claim 15 wherein enabling the member to send communications to the group of contacts using any one of multiple different applications by using the specific identifier by which the group is represented to address communications that are to be sent to the group of contacts comprises:

receiving an indication of a selected application to use to send a communication to the group of contacts; (Skarbo, Col. 9 lines 20-50, app)

recognizing that a contact within the group of contacts is identified by a single identifier that is inoperable for addressing a message to be sent using the selected application; (Skarbo, Col. 9 lines 20-50, application address book)

and omitting the contact from the group for the purpose of sending communications using the selected application. (Skarbo, Col. 9 lines 20-50, application address book)

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2145

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached Notice of references cited (if appropriate).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M. Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


AB


Jason Cardone
Supervisor Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145